



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/914,171	12/21/2001	Yau Wei Lucas Hui	851663.430USPC	1982

7590 11/06/2006

Seed Intellectual Property Law Group
Suite 6300
701 5th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/914,171		HUI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Andy S. Rao		2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,9,10,15,16,18-21 and 23-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,9,10,15,16 and 23-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/20/06 has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 9-10, 15-16, 18-21, 23-36 as filed on 3/20/06 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 9-10, 26-27, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Martin") in view of Polit et al, (hereinafter referred to as "Polit")

Martin a method of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data (Martin: figures 2-3), said data having a plurality of fields, comprising: calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first field and pixels of a second field

Art Unit: 2621

(Martin: column 2, lines 24-36); calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); calculating a ratio (Martin: column 3, lines 33-35); comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40); determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to third field based on said steps of calculating (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), as in claims 1-2. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, as in the claims. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{1-2}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{2-3}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). Accordingly, given this teaching it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Polit teaching into the Martin method by having Martin generate first and second difference values as shown by Polit into the Martin method, and use the generated ratio be used by the determining step of Martin since that generated ratio would provide a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence. The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, has all of the features of claims 1-2.

Martin discloses an apparatus of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data, said data having a plurality of fields (Martin: figure 1), comprising: a difference value calculating means for calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first field and pixels of a second field (Martin: column 2, lines 24-36), and calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); dividing means for calculating a ratio (Martin: column 3, lines 33-35) and a comparator means for comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40) and determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to said comparison (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), as in claims 9-10. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, as in the claims. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $\text{DIFF}_{1,2}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $\text{DIFF}_{2,3}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). Accordingly, given this teaching it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Polit teaching into the Martin apparatus by having Martin generate first and second difference values as shown by Polit into the

Art Unit: 2621

Martin apparatus, and use the generated ratio be used by the determining step of Martin since that generated ratio would provide a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence. The Martin apparatus, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, has all of the features of claims 9-10.

Regarding claim 26, the Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, teaches verifying whether a scene change has occurred (Polit: column 3, lines 3-40), as in the claim.

Martin a method of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data (Martin: figures 2-3), said data having a plurality of fields, comprising: calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first field and pixels of a second field (Martin: column 2, lines 24-36); calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); calculating a ratio (Martin: column 3, lines 33-35); comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40); determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to third field based on said steps of calculating (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), as in claim 27. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, teaches verifying whether a scene change has occurred, as in the claims. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{1,2}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second

Art Unit: 2621

difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $\text{DIFF}_{2,3}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15), and verifying whether a scene change has occurred (Polit: column 3, lines 3-40) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). Accordingly, given this teaching it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Polit teaching into the Martin method by having Martin generate first and second difference values as shown by Polit into the Martin method, and use the generated ratio be used by the determining step of Martin since that generated ratio would provide a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence. The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, has all of the features of claim 27.

Regarding claims 29-30, the Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, teaches of the groupings as described in claims 29 and 30 (Martin: column 4, lines 5-66), as in the claims.

5. Claims 15-16, 18-21, 23-25, 28, 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al., (hereinafter referred to as “Martin”) in view of Polit et al., (hereinafter referred to as “Polit”), and further in view of Roeder et al., (hereinafter referred to as “Roeder”).

Martin discloses an apparatus of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data, said data having a plurality of fields (Martin: figure 1), comprising: a difference value calculating means for calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first

Art Unit: 2621

field and pixels of a second field (Martin: column 2, lines 24-36), and calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); dividing means for calculating a ratio (Martin: column 3, lines 33-35) and a comparator means for comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40) and determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to said comparison (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), as in claim 15. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, a first subtractor receiving a pixel of said first field and a first pixel of said second field, a second subtractor that receives a first pixel of first field and a second pixel of a second field and calculates the difference; and a comparator selects the smaller of the pixel differences and accumulates them, as in claim 15. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $\text{DIFF}_{1,2}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $\text{DIFF}_{2,3}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). Accordingly, given this teaching it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Polit teaching into the Martin apparatus by having Martin generate first and second difference values as shown by Polit into the

Art Unit: 2621

Martin apparatus, and use the generated ratio be used by the determining step of Martin since that generated ratio would provide a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence. The Martin apparatus, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, has a majority of the features of claim 15. However, the Martin-Polit apparatus does not specifically teach of a first subtractor receiving a pixel of said first field and a first pixel of said second field, a second subtractor that receives a first pixel of first field and a second pixel of a second field and calculates the difference; and a comparator selects the smaller of the pixel differences and accumulates them. However, Roeder does (Roeder: figures 1A-1D; column 4, lines 20- 68; column 5, lines 1-8; column 2, Lines 46-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to compare the first pixel of the first field with the rest of the pixels of a second field in order to more accurately find the pixels with the most motion, which would allow for more accurate compression and display. The Martin apparatus, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder first and second subtractors and comparator, has all of the features of claim 15.

As for claim 16, the Martin apparatus, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder first and second subtractors and comparator, addresses most of the limitations of the claim have been discussed in the above rejection of claim 15, but does not specifically teach of setting to zero pixel differences that are less than a threshold. However, it is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that noise must be accounted for and therefore zeroing the difference where noise is detected so that false values are not used in the compression system, Official Notice. Also a general teaching can be found in the reference (Roeder: column 1 , lines 52-58), as in the claim.

Martin discloses an apparatus of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data, said data having a plurality of fields (Martin: figure 1), comprising: a difference value calculating means for calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first field and pixels of a second field (Martin: column 2, lines 24-36), and calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); dividing means for calculating a ratio (Martin: column 3, lines 33-35) and a comparator means for comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40) and determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to said comparison (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), a first and second memory (Martin: figure 1), as in claims 18-20. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, and a moving pixel counter, as in claim 18. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: DIFF_{1-2} “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: DIFF_{2-3} “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). Accordingly, given this teaching it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Polit teaching into the Martin apparatus by having Martin generate first

Art Unit: 2621

and second difference values as shown by Polit into the Martin apparatus, and use the generated ratio be used by the determining step of Martin since that generated ratio would provide a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence. The Martin apparatus, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, has a majority of the features of claims 18-20. However, the Martin-Polit apparatus does not specifically teach of does not specifically teach of a moving pixel counter. However, Roeder does (Roeder: figure 4 as combined with figure 8 will be the equivalent of the moving pixel counter; column 6, lines 53-68; column 7, lines 1-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Roeder's motion detector within Martin's interlaced field detector of the Martin-Polit apparatus in order to have the most accurate results since Roeder's motion detector will detect all motion occurrences. The Martin apparatus, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder motion detector, has all of the features of claims 18-20.

Regarding claim 21, the Martin apparatus, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder motion detector, teaches of the step of determining whether or not there has been a scene change between said first and third fields, at least in part based on said output of said accumulator means (Martin: column 4, Lines 41-57), as in the claim.

Martin a method of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data (Martin: figures 2-3), said data having a plurality of fields, comprising: calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first field and pixels of a second field (Martin: column 2, lines 24-36); calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said

Art Unit: 2621

first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); calculating a ratio (Martin: column 3, lines 33-35); comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40); determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to third field based on said steps of calculating (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), as in claim 23. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, calculating pixel differences between the pixel of the first field and two pixels of the second field, selecting a smaller difference between said pixel differences, accumulating said smaller pixel difference, as in claim 23. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{1-2}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{2-3}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). However, the Martin-Polit apparatus does not specifically teach of calculating pixel differences between the pixel of the first field and two pixels of the second field, selecting a smaller difference between said pixel differences, and accumulating said smaller pixel difference. However, Roeder does (Roeder: figures 1A-1D; column 4, lines 20- 68; column 5, lines 1-8; column 2, Lines 46-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to compare the first pixel of the first

Art Unit: 2621

field with the rest of the pixels of a second field in order to more accurately find the pixels with the most motion, which would allow for more accurate compression and display. The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder calculating, selecting, and accumulating steps, has all of the features of claim 23.

As for claim 24, the Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder calculating, selecting, and accumulating steps, has addresses most of the limitations of the claim have been discussed in the above rejection of claim 23, but does not specifically teach of setting to zero pixel differences that are less than a threshold. However, it is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that noise must be accounted for and therefore zeroing the difference where noise is detected so that false values are not used in the compression system, Official Notice. Also a general teaching can be found in the reference (Roeder: column 1 , lines 52-58), as in the claim.

Martin a method of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data (Martin: figures 2-3), said data having a plurality of fields, comprising: calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first field and pixels of a second field (Martin: column 2, lines 24-36); calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); calculating a ratio (Martin: column 3, lines 33-35); comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40); determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to third field based on said steps of calculating (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), as in claim 25. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the

Art Unit: 2621

second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, calculating the number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein the determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel threshold, as in claim 25. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{1-2}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{2-3}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). However, the Martin-Polit apparatus does not specifically teach of calculating the number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein the determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel threshold. However, Roeder does (Roeder: figures 1A-1D; column 4, lines 20- 68; column 5, lines 1-8; column 2, Lines 46-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to calculate the number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein a determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel

Art Unit: 2621

threshold, which would allow for more accurate compression and display. The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder moving pixel counting step, has all of the features of claim 25.

The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, has a majority of the features of claim 28, but does not specifically teach detecting a moving region by calculating the number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein the determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel threshold. However, Roeder does (Roeder: figures 1A-1D; column 4, lines 20- 68; column 5, lines 1-8; column 2, Lines 46-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to calculate the number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein a determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel threshold, which would allow for more accurate compression and display. The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder moving pixel counting step, has all of the features of claim 28.

Martin a method of processing video data to detect field characteristics of the data (Martin: figures 2-3), said data having a plurality of fields, comprising: calculating a first difference value as a difference between pixels of a first field and pixels of a second field (Martin: column 2, lines 24-36); calculating a second difference value between the pixels of said first field and the pixels of a third field (Martin: column 2, lines 11-23); calculating a ratio

Art Unit: 2621

(Martin: column 3, lines 33-35); comparing said ratio with a threshold (Martin: column 3, lines 36-40); determining whether said first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (i.e. non-interlaced) with respect to third field based on said steps of calculating (Martin: column 3, lines 50-67; column 4, lines 1-40), as in claim 31. However, Martin fails to disclose that the first difference value is generated from a first field that is successive to said second field, that the second difference value is generated from a third field that is successive to said first field, and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values, teaches verifying whether a scene change has occurred, as in the claims. Polit discloses generating a first difference value from a first field that is successive to said second field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{1-2}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), generating a second difference value from a third field that is successive to said first field (Polit: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20: $DIFF_{2-3}$ “where frame 2 is the first field”), and that the ratio is calculated between said first and second difference values (Polit: column 5, lines 1-15), and verifying whether a scene change has occurred (Polit: column 3, lines 3-40) in order to get a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence (Polit: column 5, lines 15-30: “fading factor”). Accordingly, given this teaching it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Polit teaching into the Martin method by having Martin generate first and second difference values as shown by Polit into the Martin method, and use the generated ratio be used by the determining step of Martin since that generated ratio would provide a more accurate measurement of characteristics in a video sequence. The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit, has a majority of the features of claim 31, but does not specifically teach detecting a moving region by calculating the

Art Unit: 2621

number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein the determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel threshold. However, Roeder does (Roeder: figures 1A-1D; column 4, lines 20- 68; column 5, lines 1-8; column 2, Lines 46-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to calculate the number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein a determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel threshold, which would allow for more accurate compression and display. The Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder moving pixel counting step, has all of the features of claim 31.

Regarding claims 32-33, the Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder moving pixel counting step, discloses calculating a ratio between the first and second difference value (Polit: column 5, line 1-10); and comparing the ratio to a threshold, wherein determining whether the first field is an interlaced field or a progressive field (Martin: column 3, lines 55-67; column 4, lines 1-20), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 34, the Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder moving pixel counting step, has calculating pixel differences between the pixel of the first field and two pixels of the second field, selecting a smaller difference between said pixel differences, and accumulating said smaller pixel difference

Art Unit: 2621

(Roeder: figures 1A-1D; column 4, lines 20- 68; column 5, lines 1-8; column 2, Lines 46-56), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 35-36, the Martin method, now incorporating the first and second difference values as shown by Polit and the Roeder moving pixel counting step, has detecting a moving region by calculating the number of moving pixels between said second and third fields wherein the determining step includes determining that said first field is an interlaced field if said number is lower than a moving pixel threshold and that said first and third fields are progressive if said number is not lower than the moving pixel threshold (Roeder: figures 1A-1D; column 4, lines 20- 68; column 5, lines 1-8; column 2, Lines 46-56), as in the claim.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andy S. Rao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

asr
April 24, 2006

ANDY RAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

